

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?

Moderator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

Speakers

A. A. BERLE
EARL HARRISON

ELMER THOMAS
OMAR B. KETCHUM

(See also page 12)

COMING

—June 26, 1947—

How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe?

—July 3, 1947—

Has 20th Century Civilization Improved Mankind?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.





CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 19:

"Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?"

<i>Dr.</i> HITCHCOCK	3
<i>Mr.</i> BERLE	4
<i>Senator</i> THOMAS	6
<i>Mr.</i> HARRISON	8
<i>Mr.</i> KETCHUM	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16

THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 26:

"How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe?"

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 3:

"Has 20th Century Civilization Improved Mankind?"

The Broadcast of June 19, 1947, originated in the Iowa Memorial Union Auditorium, Iowa City, Iowa, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



JUNE 19, 1947

VOL. 13, No. 8

Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?

Announcer:

It's Town Meeting time from coast to coast as we greet you tonight from Iowa City, Iowa, where our host is the State University of Iowa. Situated in the heart of America's corn belt just west of the Mississippi River, you see on this campus as on all other campuses across the country, Quonset huts, trailer camps, converted barracks, and temporary housing.

Crowding the university this summer are more than 5,000 students, many of whom are G.I.'s and their families. During the war these G.I.'s witnessed a first hand the result of Hitler's scourge of Europe, in separated families and broken homes.

So they, along with other thoughtful persons, are particularly concerned about our responsibility in the problems posed by tonight's question, "Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?" We invite you to hear

both sides as you listen to the Nation's most popular radio forum.

Now, we present our moderator, Mr. Orville Hitchcock, formerly administrative assistant to Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., and now Associate Professor of Speech here at the State University of Iowa. Mr. Hitchcock. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Good evening, friends. We are happy to welcome America's Town Meeting listeners to Iowa City, the home of the State University of Iowa. Our question tonight, "Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?" is quite appropriate. We have a lot of displaced persons in Iowa at this moment—displaced by the flood waters of the Iowa River. We came within two inches of being displaced out of the very building from which we are broadcasting.

You may remember that when the war ended there were nearly twelve million civilians stranded in

Europe. Many had been forced by Hitler to come to Germany as slave laborers. Eleven million of these refugees have been sent back home, but a million remain, held in detention camps in Germany, Austria and Italy.

What are we going to do with these people?

Should we force them to go back to their homes?

Should they be kept in detention camps indefinitely?

Should they be permitted to settle in countries where they are now held? Or should they be absorbed by nations like ours?

The Stratton Bill, now before Congress, would have us admit 100,000 displaced persons each year for the next four years. America has always been a haven for Europe's peoples. In fact, many of you have seen the Statue of Liberty standing in New York harbor with its inscription, "Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

There isn't one of us who wouldn't agree with this statement, but we realize the political and economic difficulties that are a part of any plan to bring 400,000 immigrants into the United States.

Supporting the Stratton Bill tonight are A. A. Berle, Jr., and Earl G. Harrison. Ranged on the other side are Senator Elmer Thomas and Omar B. Ketchum.

First, let's hear from A. A. Berle,

Jr., the newly elected chairman of the New York Liberal Party. Mr. Berle, formerly Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Brazil, is Professor of Law at Columbia University and a trustee of Town Hall. Mr. Berle tells me that he has a personal interest in the question tonight, as after World War I on his return from the Versailles Peace Conference, he lived for four years in a tenement on the Lower East Side of New York City with an immigrant family. Mr. Berle, why do you favor the Stratton Bill? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Berle:

Professor Hitchcock, has told you of the plight of some 1,300,000 homeless in Europe, and I am reminded of something we used to hear some time ago. It was a certain man who came down from Jerusalem to Jericho and was among thieves, and they robbed him and beat him and left him dead. Then a priest and Levite came and passed by on the other side, and then a certain Samaritan—no aristocrat was he—came and bound up his wounds and gave him shelter. Which was the good neighbor to him that was left dead?

Well, that was the old parable. Many of you, Protestants like myself, heard it in church, and many non-church-goers likewise believe in good neighborhood as the golden law of life, and the simple question raised by the Stratton Bill

admit displaced persons is whether you believe it or whether you don't.

This isn't a change in our immigration policy. The immigration law provides for permitting something like 146,000 immigrants per year. Well, during the war years we actually got almost none—not nearly that number—because they couldn't get here, although many already had visas allowing them to enter.

Actually, during six or seven years we got nearly 900,000 less than our law provided for. All that is asked now by the Stratton Bill is the admission, after the war, of less than half the number we would have got if war had not prevented immigrants from taking advantage of our existing law.

Now this million and a quarter of robbed and abandoned women and men and, God forgive us, children behind barbed wire or wandering destitute in Europe are people like you and me. Look at your neighbor and you can see one just like it.

Some were thrown out of their homes by war and some by ruthless diplomacy, God forgive us also, including diplomacy of some of our own Allies.

These people are of all races—80 per cent are Gentiles, about 20 per cent Jewish. They include much of the best blood and hardest-working stock in all Europe. All of you have known this and

grieved. But now you can do something practical about it—and so, Stratton's Bill to admit 100,000 per year for four years. We are merely asked to be the Samaritans. You're going to hear the arguments for passing by on the other side. You'll hear that 100,000 of these may take jobs which Americans want, although of each 100,000 more than half will be women and children who are not in the labor market; will take houses Americans need. It might be a good idea to build some houses instead. (*Applause.*)

I come from New York where most of these people will settle, but all New York wants you not to pass by on the other side. I quote, for instance, from the resolution of the Liberal Party which includes the veterans and the tenement dwellers and the union leaders and just people—the people who would be worrying about their jobs and their crowded houses, but they're not.

Their resolution says, "We support the Stratton Bill for admission of displaced persons as an act of common human decency. It will add to the strength of our country's life by giving these people the opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Now those are the people who are going to meet the problem. Not the people who are objecting.

The opponents of the Stratton

Bill are sincere, but they don't speak for the cities which want these immigrants and will absorb them, and gladly. We need not change the settled immigration policy of the country a bit. We merely use up now the quotas we had before. Because you see, I think, that democracy, which is now challenged overseas is not organized selfishness. It is organized morality. That's why it's strong.

The selfish interests make the noises in Washington, but you who listen and think more soundly know that selfishness is not enough. As a diplomat and a student of history, I know that history passes its verdict on nations also. "As ye have done it to the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me." (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Now, here is Senator Elmer Thomas, Democrat of Oklahoma, and member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Mr. Berle, I'm afraid that Senator Thomas is going to take issue with you. As a United States delegate to the Quebec Food and Agricultural Organization and to the Copenhagen Conference, he has formed a different opinion on this question. Senator Thomas, why do you disagree with Mr. Berle on this issue? (*Applause.*)

Senator Thomas:

Now that we've had the invocation by Dr. Berle (*laughter*), we

shall proceed to discuss the question, "Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?" To this question my answer is "No" for the following reasons.

Under existing law, a total of some 154,000 immigrants from 25 countries may come to the United States each year. Hence, to admit 400,000 now would require that Congress pass a special bill and such a law would be heralded as an invitation to Europe's millions to come to America.

Under existing law, Americans may have their relatives from abroad join them here in the States. Hence, this proposal is to admit 400,000 in addition to the number permitted to enter under the present quota system.

Who are these people we're talking about? They are a portion of the surplus populations of displaced, homeless, and jobless men, women, and children now confined in refugee and concentration camps in the overcrowded countries of Europe.

We sympathize with unfortunate people everywhere, but now we are asked to extend more than sympathy. We're asked to pass special law, to open our immigration gates, to provide and equip homes, to find jobs and to pay a large part if not all the costs of this program. This proposal, if carried out, will cost money.

Many Americans seemingly immune to the 260 billions of

debt, to burdensome and heavy taxation, heavy expenses called for by the federal, state, city, and local budgets.

Who are to pay these bills? The answer—you, the taxpayers of America.

Let me remind you that the United States cannot become the guardian of all the peoples of the world. Our first duty is to take care of our own people residing under the American Flag.

Our population now is increasing at the rate of some two million per year. In a few years, we are certain to have at least 200 million people to house, feed, and support with employment. Overpopulation is coming to be considered war criminal No. 1. Most, if not all, wars have been waged by the aggressors for additional lands on which to settle their surplus population.

Italy, over-populated, waged war on Ethiopia for new lands for settlement. Germany, over-populated, claimed that she must have more land for her surplus population. Japan, over-populated, waged war for more land on which to locate her rapidly increasing people.

We must not take chances on admitting aliens and then later have to find new lands for their use.

Let me state two additional reasons why I oppose the proposal

to bring 400,000 of Europe's homeless to the United States now.

1. Our own ex-servicemen and women, in the search for houses and jobs, should not be subjected to this additional competition.

2. Our American working men and women likewise should not have to meet such additional competition for jobs and wages.

Every alien who comes here must have at least two things—a house and a job. And all available houses and jobs should be reserved for our own people.

Some contend that our door should be opened wide for the displaced and impoverished people of the world. To such a program I cannot subscribe. Let me remind you that we had some fifteen million men and women in the recent war. While they were in the military service they likewise were displaced persons and hundreds of thousands of them will continue to be displaced until they find homes and jobs.

It is true that America is comparatively a new country and that our citizens are the descendants of former immigrants, mostly from Europe. Formerly, when the several states were thinly populated, there was ample room for aliens, but now, with no new frontiers left, the time has come for serious consideration of admitting additional aliens into the United States. Instead of providing additional immigration, I favor the closing

of our gates to aliens for a period of at least five years and until our reconversion and stabilization programs are perfected.

As a Senator, I am supporting proposals to make loans and to provide relief and assistance to the unfortunates in foreign lands to the end that they may be enabled to help themselves. Further than that, I am insisting that America should and must be preserved for Americans. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Senator Thomas. Now we will hear Earl G. Harrison, Dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania and formerly United States Commissioner of Immigration and chairman of the Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons. You will remember that, as President Truman's representative, to investigate conditions in German detention camps, Mr. Harrison's report aroused a storm of controversy.

Mr. Harrison, let's hear your arguments on this question. Mr. Harrison, speaking to you from Philadelphia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Harrison:

My reasons for favoring Congressional action authorizing admittance of 400,000 of Europe's homeless have expanded as I have discussed the question with fellow-Americans in the last eight or ten months.

At the beginning, I was impressed primarily with two facts: first, that we American taxpayers were spending huge sums of money, anywhere from 130 to 180 million dollars annually to support these people in camps, in idleness. Senator Thomas mentioned the tax burden. He did not mention the present cost being borne by the American taxpayer. (*Applause.*)

You see I had visited some of those camps as was pointed out in Germany, in Austria, and I knew that most of the people did not want charity or to be supported. They are workers, and they want freedom and work. Many of them have relatives and friends in this country who would take them and help them. So, the millions we are spending are not helping to solve the problem.

In the second place, I was impressed by and I knew about, of course, those more than 900,000 immigration quota places that have not been filled during the war years. So like a lot of other people, I put these two facts together and concluded we could save a great deal of tax money, get some sorely needed agricultural and other workers and so use considerably less than half the places unfilled during the war years.

But these are rather cold facts. Throughout the United States, over 70 national organizations—church

labor, civic, women's clubs—have studied the problem and have gone on record as favoring the Stratton Bill. These groups include the Federal Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Federation of Labor, and the C.I.O.

The letters I have from William Green and Philip Murray, as well as from religious readers such as Cardinal Spellman, Reverend Samuel McCray Cavert, and Mrs. Harper Sibley, national president of the United Council of Church Women—all these letters stress the fact that the plight of the homeless people is a challenge to our common humanity.

The opposition comes principally from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the D.A.R. Actually, the Legion has not had opportunity to consider the precise proposal in convention. The Legion is just against any change in our immigration laws. I sometimes think that on the subject of immigration, the Legion would rather be consistent than right. (*Applause.*)

The Veterans of Foreign Wars showed their real attitude when they introduced into the present Congress a bill which would suspend *all* immigration into the United States for a period of ten years. This would permit of no exceptions—not even for very close relatives of United States

citizens or of ex-service men. And I want to point out that Senator Thomas was wrong in saying that relatives of citizens may now be admitted. That applies only to husbands or wives. Well, such an extreme position as has been taken by Veterans of Foreign Wars speaks for itself.

The opposition of at least some members of the D.A.R. has been removed by pointing out that by D.P.'s we do not really mean "Displaced Persons," but "Delayed Pilgrims." (*Laughter and applause.*)

Opposition is based upon arguments more superficial and plausible than real. Senator Thomas fears over-population of the United States, saying we are certain to have within a few years at least 200 million people. Well, Senator Thomas, the population experts tell us we will not build up our population even to 165 million by 1990.

Now I want to ask—how can the admittance of a group of people amounting to less than three-tenths of one per cent of our population seriously affect housing or employment? Probably more than 75 per cent of the people who could come here can be housed by those who are ready to welcome them.

Most of them are farmers and would naturally go to the rural areas. Many are carpenters, masons, and plumbers who would

help with our house-building program. Many of the women and children, while they would be consumers—and you remember, as Mr. Berle pointed out, that more than half of the displaced persons are women and children—they certainly would not be competitors for jobs.

Some of the women, I am told, have had experience as household workers, and it seems to me I have heard of some shortages of such workers, here and there.

Our present immigration laws which provide numerous screening tests would remain intact and would give us ample protection. We can, by the single act, of passing this temporary legislation, serve our own best interests by adding some good sturdy workers to our population where we need them and, at the same time, help in the solution of the international problem of Europe's homeless.

We cannot talk international cooperation and in practice reject it. We cannot urge resettlement of these people in other nations unless we are willing to do our part. In the light of our size, our strength, and the American tradition, our part is really so very small. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Mr. Harrison. Now, to round off our discussion here is the representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of their na-

tional legislative service. Mr. Ketchum. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Ketchum:

You know I'm somewhat confused after listening to the statements of my opponents. Earl Harrison says that most of the D. P.'s are farmers, and will undoubtedly settle in rural areas while Adolph Berle admits frankly that it is his beloved New York and a few other cities that will have to cope with these newcomers. (*Laughter.*)

Now, I agree with Berle. If any of them get west of Brooklyn, I will be surprised. (*Laughter.*) And the soil that they will till you can put under my fingernails, if it's not already there.

This proposal is, in my opinion, another example of the misguided visionary and impractical liberalism which is undermining our American way of life and threatens to substitute some form of collectivism in the place of our free enterprise system. (*Applause.*)

I'm not only opposed to admitting these extra 400,000 aliens, I agree wholeheartedly with my organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States that all immigration quotas should be suspended for several years. Let's take a look at this proposal which is contained in the pending before the Congress.

The title of the bill reads in part, "to authorize the United States during an emergency per-

to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy," etc.

What do they mean, undertake our share? When you consider that this Nation has already admitted between 600,000 and one million refugees since the beginning of the war—more than 20 times that of any other nation—it could hardly be said that the American people are not already doing their fair share.

When you add to the fact that the American people have expended over 350 billion dollars and have suffered a million casualties to free these people from tyranny and bondage, why the whole argument is preposterous.

Now, who are these so-called homeless? Far from being the slave labor, which was dragged into Germany by the Nazis, the records reveal that most of these people rushed into the American Zone and camps in 1945, '46, and '47.

Why did they swarm in and become displaced persons? First, because the Russians undoubtedly encouraged them as being undesirable, and second, because the word got around that the generous Yanks would care bountifully for all who applied for relief.

Assuming the Allies won the war and destroyed Nazi tyranny, why are these persons displaced and unable to return to their homelands? Is it because they have

no stomach for the hard work and sacrifices necessary to rehabilitate themselves in their homelands and would prefer the comparative ease and comfort in the United States?

There are thousands of Americans—many here in Iowa—made homeless by recent floods, tornados, and explosions who must work and sacrifice to rehabilitate themselves and their homes. Are these aliens more deserving?

The proponents of this liberal cause say that it is a decent and neighborly thing to do. I should like to ask, Mr. Berle, and Mr. Harrison, why this proposal is confined to central, eastern, and southern Europeans. Why not include the Chinese and the Hindus? War ravaged those countries, and I venture to state there are more bona fide homeless persons in a few square miles of China and India than in all of Central Europe. I strongly suspect that pressure from racial voting minorities in the United States had much to do with the drive for these 400,000 Europeans. The Chinese and Hindus are not so fortunate.

If our liberal leaders have a sincere desire to do something for homeless, displaced, and unemployed persons, may I suggest they can find plenty to occupy their attention right here in the United States? I refer specifically to hundreds of thousands of our most loyal and patriotic citizens,

the ones to whom we owe the most—our veterans.

About 40 per cent of the men who were in uniform are living doubled up with friends or relatives, or occupying makeshift quarters, and nearly 25 per cent of all married veterans are without homes of their own.

Most economists agree that the United States will soon head into

a business recession that will become a real depression. I can see no purpose served by this immigration proposal except to further increase the growing confusion, industrial and class warfare, racial discontent, and to further aggravate an already serious housing shortage and a growing unemployment problem.

It's high time the American

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

OMAR BARTLETT KETCHUM — Mr. Ketchum, born in Hardy, Arkansas, in 1897, is National Director of the Legislative Service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. From 1919 to 1931, Mr. Ketchum engaged in the printing business in Topeka. From 1931 to 1935, he was mayor of Topeka. In 1934, he was a Democratic candidate for Governor of Kansas and in 1936, he was a candidate for the U. S. Senate. He served in the Army for two years during World War I. In 1940 he was chief of staff of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

ADOLPH AUGUSTUS BERLE, JR.—A lawyer and a former Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Berle is also a former Ambassador to Brazil. He was born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1895. He has an A.B. degree, an A.M., and an LL.B. from Harvard University. He entered the practice of law in New York City in 1916 and is now a partner in the office of Berle & Berle.

From 1925 to 1928, Mr. Berle was a lecturer on finance at Harvard Business School. He has also been an associate professor of corporation law at Columbia Law School since 1927.

During World War I, Mr. Berle served in the Infantry and was on the staff of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace with Germany. He has been a special counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a financial adviser of the American Embassy in Cuba, and a chamberlain of New York City. In 1938, he became Assistant Secretary of State. In January, 1945, he was appointed Ambassador to Brazil, a position from which he resigned in February, 1946.

Mr. Berle is the author of several books and magazine articles on financial matters.

ELMER THOMAS — Senator Thomas, a member from Oklahoma of the United States Senate since 1927, was also a

member of the 68th and 69th Congresses (1923-27). After graduating from Central Normal College in Indiana, he received an A.B. degree from DePauw University. In addition, he holds honorary J.U.D. and LL.D. degrees. Senator Thomas was admitted to the bar in Indiana in 1897, and in Oklahoma in 1900. He was formerly owner and operator of Medicine Park, Oklahoma, where he now makes his home. He was a member of the Oklahoma Senate for 13 years, and chairman of the Democratic State Convention in 1910.

EARL GRANT HARRISON—Born in Philadelphia, Pa., in 1899, Mr. Harrison received his A.B. and his LL.B. degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. He is now Dean of the Law School of the same University. Mr. Harrison has engaged in the practice of law in Philadelphia since 1923. At intervals he has been an instructor of law at the University until he became professor and Dean in 1945.

In 1940-41, Mr. Harrison was director of alien registration for the U.S. Dept. of Justice. In 1941-42, he was special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, and from 1942 to 1944, was U. S. commissioner of immigration and naturalization. Since 1945, Mr. Harrison has been the United States representative of the Intergovernment Committee on Refugees.

During World War I, Mr. Harrison was a Second Lieutenant in the U. S. Infantry.

ORVILLE HITCHCOCK — Mr. Hitchcock was formerly associated with Town Hall as administrative assistant to George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator of Town Meeting of the Air. Mr. Hitchcock is now associate professor of speech at State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

people threw off the hypnotic spell woven around them by the international "do-gooders" and demand a return to an enlightened national self-interest. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Mr. Ketchum. Now will you, Senator Thomas, and Mr. Berle, join me around the microphone while Mr. Harrison comes in from Philadelphia, so that we can dig a little deeper into these issues. Mr. Harrison, I'll bet you have something to say right now.

Mr. Harrison: I'd like to ask Mr. Ketchum where he got those figures that we have admitted 600,000 to a million refugees so far. He can't possibly sustain that allegation unless he's including the people who were admitted for temporary stays, many of which left last year and are still leaving.

Mr. Ketchum: That information has been developed consistently before the hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Congress. Furthermore, in June of 1946, Attorney General Clark said that there were two million* aliens coming illegally into this country. As a matter of fact, in the last six months of 1946, the Immigration Service actually picked up 85,000 of them.

*Editor's Note: Mr. Ketchum said on the air "two million." By telegram, the editor was asked to change this figure to "two thousand." The latter figure is not consistent with other figures used in the statement nor by Mr. Berle later in the discussion.

It's never been disputed that between 600,000 and one million have come into this country as refugees since the beginning of the war. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Harrison: Do you realize that Attorney General Clark was talking about people who cross the Mexican border and have nothing whatsoever to do with Europeans. (*Shouts and laughter.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: We don't want this to be a private argument between Mr. Harrison and Mr. Ketchum here. Let's see if we can get some official word from the Senator on this question. Senator Thomas, do you want to say a word about this?

Senator Thomas: I think it's admitted in Washington that we're having a large number of persons coming across the line unauthorized. As to the number, I'm unable to give you any definite figures.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Berle?

Mr. Berle: I can throw some light on that. I was Assistant Secretary of State in charge of immigration. There came, among other things, a committee from the Southwestern states, including a representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, imploring me to make special arrangements to let in a very large number of Mexicans to take off the crops. That's one of the groups that are included in this figure of two million people. We asked for them.

We needed them. We wanted them and we got them.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Ketchum, you can come back in now and defend yourself on that charge.

Mr. Ketchum: Why, it was developed on the Floor of the House as a matter of public record that planes were being flown from Egypt and Palestine directly to Miami, Florida. They were coming in without even visas—coming into this country. I don't think there's the slightest question. I don't know why these gentlemen are questioning that 600,000 to a million figure. It's been developed before these hearings. Some of the most ardent proponents of this measure did not dispute it in hearings when those statements were made. I think the Immigration Service itself will support those statements.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Harrison, why are you questioning the figures?

Mr. Harrison: I'm questioning the figures for several different reasons. For example, we know still that the Immigration Service is asked *not* to try to remove some of the Mexican agricultural workers who have entered the country illegally because there is such a shortage of agricultural workers in Texas. And my good friend, Congressman Gossett is constantly disturbed by the fact that his constituents would like him to aid in keeping the immi-

gration service from enforcing the immigration laws.

The other facts that Mr. Ketchum referred to just aren't facts. They just don't exist at all.

Mr. Hitchcock: Now, Mr. Ketchum, you should have the chance to ask a question of Mr. Harrison because he asked one of you that started all of this. What do you want to ask him?

Mr. Ketchum: Well, in the first place I don't agree with Mr. Harrison's charges that they're no facts. I don't think he's any more informed on this than any of us else. Again I say, all this evidence has been submitted before the Hearing Committee of Congress and none of the proponents has challenged or denied the allegation.

I want to mention something here. They're talking about the people being homeless and displaced. Listen, I want to give Mr. Harrison a real authority. I refer to Major General Lowell V. Rooks who is the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. On June 4—now this is the Director General of the organization that is looking after those displaced persons—General Rooks charged that the statement which was made by a certain refugee committee* was inspired by political and not humanitarian motives. The pu-

*See Editor's note on page 24

pose behind it, he declared is to block, even at the expense of gross slander, any further repatriation of Poles, Balts, Ukrainians, Yugoslavians, to their homelands.

Now get this. I want you to get this. They say that it's persecution that's keeping these people from going home. Now get this—just one more statement here. In defense of repatriation, when there are no political hazards involved, General Rooks pointed out that of more than seven million persons repatriated since the end of the war, not one substantiated incident of persecution after repatriation had come to his attention and not one instance of persecution has been presented to the committee which is holding hearings on this bill. Yet they say it is persecution or fear of persecution that is keeping these people from going home.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Ketchum. Now we'll give you a chance to talk a little more during the question period. Now while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message. But first, let's pause for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air brought to you by Town Hall and the American Broadcasting Company. Originating tonight in the auditorium of the Iowa Memorial Union at the State Univer-

sity of Iowa, Iowa City, where we are discussing the question, "Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?"

You have just heard from A. A. Berle, Jr., Earl G. Harrison, Senator Elmer Thomas, and Omar B. Ketchum. You can read what they have had to say and the questions and answers to follow in the Town Meeting Bulletin which we print each week for your convenience.

The Town Meeting Bulletin is a complete transcript of tonight's broadcast, and you may secure your copy by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

If you would like to receive this Bulletin regularly each week for 11 weeks, enclose \$1; for six months, \$2.35; and for one year, \$4.50. Remember the address, Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Allow at least two weeks for delivery.

Remember, too, that this is your Town Meeting. We want to discuss the questions that are uppermost in your minds, the issues which are vital to the formation of our American policy at home and abroad. We try to pick such subjects but how can we know what you think is important unless you tell us. Won't you write your suggestions for future Town Meeting subjects? Tell us the issues you think are vital, the problems you are discussing.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Hitchcock: Now here's where you and the audience have a chance to win a \$210 set of the *Encyclopedia Americana*. If our judges pick your question as best for bringing out new facts and increasing understanding of tonight's subject and if you limit your question to 25 words or less, a 30-volume set of the *Encyclopedia Americana* will be on its way to you tomorrow. So make your questions brief and to the point.

Questions, please! Here's a gentleman back here in the red tie who has a question. Yes?

Man: I want to ask my question of Mr. Berle. Mr. Berle, would not these displaced people be of more assistance in the creation of a stable Europe if they remained on that continent?

Mr. Hitchcock: That's a good constructive question, Mr. Berle.

Mr. Berle: I wish I thought they were. If there were any chance of their getting to work on stabilizing Europe, I think they would be already at it. They come here not because they want to, but because they can find no place to head in.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, sir, thank you very much. Now we have another question back here. The gentleman has one all ready. Will you present yours?

Man: I have a question for Mr. Ketchum. After fighting to give

oppressed peoples the right of self-determination, how can we who fought for freedom keep the "delayed pilgrims" from seeking their future in the United States?

Mr. Hitchcock: These all seem to be well thought-out questions, Mr. Ketchum. What would you say to that?

Mr. Ketchum: Let me say this: if all of those who agreed to the principle of the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta agreements had remained faithful to those agreements, there would be no displaced persons problems in Europe. I agree with the question that was previously asked, that if the people are worth their salt, they will remain at home and help rehabilitate their homelands. (Applause.)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Ketchum. Now we have a gentleman back here in a brown coat who has a question to ask. Would you tell us what your name is and to whom your question is addressed?

Man: My question is to Senator Thomas. If the war had not prevented immigrants from entering the United States, would you not be preaching the doctrine of overpopulation? If not, then why your fears, now?

Mr. Hitchcock: I thought you were the person who wasn't preach-

ng, Senator Thomas, tonight. Will you try that question?

Senator Thomas: The record shows that the population of this country is increasing at a rate of approximately two million per year. You can multiply that two million by twenty-five, so that in fifty years we'll have an increase of 50 million. We now have something like 145 million people here already, so in twenty-five years at least, we'll have two hundred million people in United States, if the rate of increase is maintained.

Mr. Harrison: May I make a comment, Mr. Moderator?

Mr. Hitchcock: Yes, come in, sir.

Mr. Harrison: Aren't there any people who are going to die in the next twenty-five years? *(Laughter and applause.)*

Senator Thomas: That question answers itself. The record shows that in spite of those who die the total population is increasing approximately two million people per year. *(Laughter and applause.)*

Mr. Hitchcock: All right. Mr. Harrison, do you want to add anything to that at this point before we take another question?

Mr. Harrison: Except that that's not correct. *(Laughter.)* About a million and a half people die each year and our population is not increasing, taking that into account, at the rate of two million a year.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, we'll decide that's something we won't

settle here at the moment. *(Laughter.)* We'll go on to another question. Here's a gentleman in a dark suit over here who has a question for us.

Man: My question is to Mr. Harrison. Brazil has indicated a willingness to accept all the displaced persons of Europe. Does this invitation constitute an acceptable solution of this problem?

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Harrison, do you think it does?

Mr. Harrison: I doubt that it would, even if it existed. Brazil is willing to take some of the displaced persons. Brazil is one of some six or eight countries that have already indicated and some have really launched a program to take some of them. But there's a limit of the number that those countries can take. Therefore, it's very important that the United States should assume a position of leadership with respect to the problem.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Berle's our authority on Brazil, too, Mr. Harrison. He jumped to his feet and when he noticed that you were answering it as he would have answered it, he sat down again. Do you have anything to add, Mr. Berle, to that?

Mr. Berle: I was Ambassador to Brazil when we were asked to ask them to take these people, so I know the facts. They asked me how many we were willing to take and I couldn't answer them. I

hope you'll give us the answer tonight. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Now we have at least eight or nine people on their feet ready to ask questions. We need a feminine voice in this at this moment and I see a lady back there in a brilliant red coat, who's going to ask a question. Yes?

Lady: Senator Thomas. Can we morally justify the loan to Turkey who didn't even take part in the war, and yet deny help to the people who suffered from the war and are willing to work and build for peace?

Mr. Hitchcock: Can we justify, morally, the loan to—to what country? To Britain?

Lady: To Turkey.

Mr. Hitchcock: To Turkey, yes. Can we justify the loan to Turkey when we're not willing to spend money on refugees in the countries which did fight?

Senator Thomas: As I understand this proposal that's being discussed tonight, we are to pay the expenses of transportation of these displaced persons to America. My program is to make loans, to send relief, and let them stay on their own land. I think it's much cheaper and much more desirable. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Harrison: May I make a comment on that, Mr. Moderator?

Mr. Hitchcock: Come in, Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Harrison: The fact is that it costs the American taxpayer \$300

a year to maintain each person, in idleness, in a displaced persons camp. For \$200 he could be brought here and placed in a job and made self-supporting. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, so Mr. Ketchum wants to make comment on that question. Yes Mr. Ketchum.

Mr. Ketchum: Mr. Harrison is making a lot of comments. I'd like to cut in with one. He seems to be concerned about cost. Since when have the great liberals in this country, like Mr. Harrison, been concerned with what this Government spends? (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Harrison: I've been concerned about it for quite some time, Mr. Ketchum. I think just about as long as you have been. (*Laughter and applause.*) I'm particularly concerned with it now—when we are spending so many hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain people, who would like to work if they're given a chance to do so, and a place to live.

Mr. Hitchcock: Now we know that Mr. Harrison and Mr. Ketchum both are concerned about the money that our Government spends. Here's a gentleman who has been standing a long while and has a question.

Man: I'd like to address my question to Mr. Berle. Is there any foundation of truth in the contention of some people that d

placed persons are displaced because they are intellectually and morally inferior?

Mr. Berle: There is not, and if there were, the regular immigration tests apply. Anyone morally or mentally unable to make the grade simply would not get in. That's just a bogey that is raised to make some trouble. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, sir. Can we have another question. I see a gentleman over on this side of the auditorium. Yes, sir.

Man: Mr. Ketchum, don't you think that Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians who do not desire a communistic state would make pretty good American citizens?

Mr. Hitchcock: Do you think that the Latvians and Estonians would make good American citizens?

Mr. Ketchum: Well, there might be some of them who would, but I doubt if those who are in those particular camps in the American Zone would make good citizens. I want you to bear in mind that of the number of persons who are in those camps—let's get some facts on this—about 50 per cent are Poles, about 26 per cent of them are Russians and Ukrainians, about 20 per cent of them are Jews, and the balance are divided between Yugoslavs and the other Balt peoples. Remember, 26 per cent are Russians and Ukrainians, 30 per cent are Poles, 50 per cent are Jews and the re-

maining per cent divided among the other Baltic Nations.

Mr. Harrison: May I make a comment, Mr. Moderator?

Mr. Hitchcock: Yes, come right in. Mr. Ketchum's going to stand by because he has something more to say.

Mr. Harrison: Well, I wish he would, because what I'm about to say deals with what he just said. How about the 17 per cent of the people in the displaced persons camps who are Balts—that is Latvians, Lithuanians, or Estonians? I still think he ought to answer that question.

Mr. Hitchcock: Yes, that's the question.

Mr. Harrison: Wouldn't they make—many of them—very good American citizens. The spirit of this country was aroused, when 45 Estonians found a boat—

Mr. Ketchum: Well, Mr. Harrison, are you going to make a speech or are you going to ask me a question? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Harrison: Well, I think you've got the point—you've got a good point there. You go ahead and struggle with the question I have asked.

Mr. Hitchcock: We all have the question now straight in mind, Mr. Harrison. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Ketchum: The question asked me as I understand it, and which Mr. Harrison just made a speech on, is do I believe that certain of these nationalities who are

now in those camps — and he enumerated them—I can't remember all the names—do I believe they would make good American citizens? I say that it's entirely possible that many of those people would make American citizens. I don't believe, however—

Mr. Harrison: That answers my question.

Mr. Ketchum: I don't believe, however, that the fact that they're willing to turn their backs on their own home lands and run away means that they're going to be an addition to our national economy and to our concepts and ideals of a political form of government.

Mr. Hitchcock: Are you still satisfied, Mr. Harrison, that the question is answered?

Mr. Harrison: Yes, the question was answered, but then he said something wrong after that. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, I think we'll go ahead with some more questions here. We have a lot of people standing who are just dying to ask questions of the speakers. Here's a gentleman in the front row who has a question. Yes, sir.

Man: I want to ask Senator Thomas, in view of the fact that in the course of the 19th century this country admitted 30 millions of foreigners from abroad, why should he be so concerned about less than one-half million more in this time of great crisis? Does

he repudiate the sentiment of lady of Bedloe Island, according to the inscription on her base: she says to Europe, "Send to your poor, your homeless, ye outcast, those struggling to be born, for them I lift my lamp beside the golden door"? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: A little more than 25 words, but I think you will want to answer.

Senator Thomas: My answer to that were that inscription written now, it would be written entirely differently. There was a time when we had many frontiers in the United States. We have no frontier left. The last frontier has been settled. I think that we should hold what we do have left for the sons and daughters of the present American population.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Berle was to—

Mr. Harrison: May I make a comment on that?

Mr. Hitchcock: Would you wait a minute, Mr. Harrison, until Mr. Berle says a word about the frontier?

Mr. Berle: If the frontier were merely territorial, I should still say we're one of the least populated countries in the world, but there is still the frontier of the engine, the factory, and, if you like, Brooklyn, too. It grows, and that's where people are absorbed today. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Now, Mr. H

ison, would you like to come in again?

Mr. Harrison: I wanted to point out the first time that the statement was made on the floor of the Congress along the lines of what Senator Thomas just said, Representative Harrison G. Otis of Massachusetts said, "It might have been all right to admit foreigners when the country was new, but it is no longer so." That was said June 26, 1797. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Well, that brings us up to date on tonight's subject and I see a gentleman in a brown coat who has a very vigorous question to ask, I know.

Man: I'd like to address this question to the entire forum, but since there is one who must answer the question to begin with, I'll address it to Mr. Berle. My question brings in not the domestic side of the question, but the international side of the question.

Mr. Hitchcock: Remember, there's a 25-word limit.

Man: This is the question. (*Laughter.*) What will be the possible and probable political repercussions from the other major powers of the world if the United States admits these displaced persons?"

Mr. Berle: The probability is that they will be more generous in admitting a few of the other 100,000.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, sir. I wonder if that satisfies the gen-

tleman back there. Well, let's go ahead and hear another feminine voice. We've had only one question by a woman so far.

Lady: Mr. Berle. Would admitting these people tend to increase Europe's confidence in our good intentions and thereby make the smaller countries more willing to resist Russian pressure?

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Berle, we're working you hard.

Mr. Berle: I think undoubtedly it will increase the feeling which other countries badly want to have, that the United States represents a strong, a confident, and a moral force. I think the exhibition of a frightened little America whose 145 million people can't stand another hundred thousand, is no exhibition to give other countries confidence in us. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Ketchum has a comment to make on this. We have only forty seconds, Mr. Ketchum.

Mr. Ketchum: I want to give you some area for population figures—talking about people wanting some place to go. In Australia, for example, there are 2.5 persons per square mile; Africa, 14.7; Canada, 3.1; U.S.A., 43.7; and in South America, 14.1. Now, there's plenty of room and plenty of places for these people to go without coming to the most crowded of all of those.

Mr. Harrison: In other words, let George do it.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Harrison and Mr. Ketchum. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here is a message of interest to you.

Announcer: Are you listening to tonight's discussion with an open mind? Ask yourself a few questions. Are the arguments for your side really more convincing, or are you letting your prejudices guide your thinking? Prejudice can slip into our thinking and conversation before we realize it. Wars intensify racial and religious hatreds, and in the wake of war, these differences endanger our democratic institutions.

It was Hitler's hope that the United States could be divided along racial and religious lines, and thus be destroyed. We cannot afford a divided America with Protestant against Catholics, Christian against Jew, white against black.

What can we do to break through the wall of tensions created by prejudice? We can refuse to listen or spread stories which discredit members of any race or religion. We can make sure that we judge our neighbors by their character and what's in their hearts, not by where they live or where they worship, or by the color of their skin.

Think twice before you voice your opinions and help to build a stronger and even truer democ-

racy. Now for a summary of tonight's discussion, here is Orville Hitchcock.

Mr. Hitchcock: Now, for the first summary, here's Mr. Ketchum.

Mr. Ketchum: I am sure you will agree that Senator Thomas and I have fairly presented our opposition to this latest immigration proposal. We have pointed out that the issue should be determined by what is best for the people of the United States. We have submitted evidence to show that we already have a tremendous problem in providing housing and employment for millions of our finest citizens—the veterans.

We have pointed out the evils of over-population and the rapidly growing population of our people. We have seriously questioned the status of these so-called D.P.'s and their desirability as citizens of our Nation.

We have challenged the contentions of our opponents that bringing in these European D.P.'s is the neighborly and humane thing to do, why confine this humane policy to a few hundred thousand eastern and southern Europeans.

We have pointed out the disparity between our opponents when one says that these D.P.'s are mostly farmers and the other admits that they will largely settle in the cities. This is the beginning of a cunning scheme to destroy the quota system and the Nation

Origins Act. It should not pre-
vail. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr.
Ketchum. Now may we hear from
Mr. A. Berle, Jr. Mr. Berle.

Mr. Berle: I think you have
fairly heard the issue. On the one
hand, you have a group of men
who are afraid that 100,000 people
coming into the United States will
endanger housing, jobs, and popu-
lation. They ought to be engaged
in a campaign for fewer babies,
instead of in a campaign to stop
the immigration.

You have heard about housing,
and yet you and I and all of us
know that the remedy has got to
be more houses and not by any
means fewer immigrants.

You have heard the possibility
that these may be southern and
eastern Europeans. Most of them
are. So is Einstein, so are a great
many other people who we are
glad to have here—the people
who helped us to win the war.

Finally, you've heard what the
national interest of the United
States is—the great interest—is
that the United States shall be true
to its democratic ideals and tell
the world that it is not afraid.
(*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you,
Mr. A. Berle, Jr., Omar Ketchum,
Senator Elmer Thomas, and Earl
Warren for helping us to see the
issue involved in the question
"Should We Admit 400,000 of
Europe's Homeless Now?" For

America's Town Meeting, I'm
happy to thank the State Univer-
sity of Iowa for being our host
this week.

Next week, June 26, the Town
Meeting will come to you from
Pueblo, Colorado, where we will
discuss the question "How Can
We Halt the Spread of Russian
Power in Europe?" Our speakers
will be Senator Wayne Morse, Re-
publican of Oregon; Palmer Hoyt,
editor and publisher of the *Denver
Post*, Robert Kennedy, Southern
California chairman of the P.C.A.;
and Charles A. Graham, Denver
attorney; our guest moderator, Mr.
Gregor Ziemer, educational direc-
tor of Town Hall.

On July 3, your Town Meeting
will be on the air in the air. Using
the world's most modern airplane
as its setting, America's Town
Meeting will broadcast from an
American Airlines DC-6, flying
over Los Angeles. Our subject,
fitting in appropriately with the
setting, will be "Has 20th Century
Civilization Improved Mankind?"
The speakers will be Dr. Lin
Yutang, Dr. Harlow Shapley,
Lewis Browne and the Reverend J.
Herbert Smith. The huge Amer-
ican Airlines Flagship will carry
its own audience of 54 people
selected from all over the country.

Now here's tonight's *Encyclo-
pedia Americana* winner — Mrs.
Leonard Maley and her question,
"Would admitting these people

increase smaller countries' confidence in us and make them more prone to resist Russian pressure?" Congratulations, Mrs. Maley. (*Applause.*)

Thanks to this fine audience at the State University of Iowa

gathered here in the auditorium of the Iowa Memorial Union for your enthusiastic participation in the program. We hope you'll be with us next week and every week at the sound of the crisis bell.

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The following statement from the Refugee Defense Committee is published since that organization was referred to by Mr. Ketchum and was not in a position to defend itself:

"In reply to General Rooks, the Refugee Defense Committee is not opposed to repatriation in principle. We believe that for all those not opposed to Communism, or indifferent to it, repatriation is the logical solution. We also are convinced, on the basis of the mass of evidence which General Rooks apparently ignores, that repatriation is not the solution for those refugees who are opposed to Communism.

"We cannot accept General Rooks' declaration that there has been no evidence of persecution

in the case of any displaced persons repatriated by UNRRA. We would point out that UNRRA has not been permitted to have any observers in the Baltic countries, nor have there been representatives of the democratic press; and in the face of repeated reports of mass deportation to Siberia from the Baltic countries, we find it difficult to understand how General Rooks could venture sweeping an assertion.

"General Rooks has apparently overlooked the statement of Richard C. Patterson, Jr., former ambassador to Yugoslavia, that 'slave labor in its vilest form exists in that country, and the report carried by the *New York Times* that the total number of slave laborers in Yugoslavia is in excess of 500,000.'